



## Minutes for CCAC Meeting

Date of Meeting: August 22, 2007
Name of Committee: CITY CENTER ADVISORY COMMISSION
Location: Tigard Library - Community Room, 13125 SW Hall Blvd.
Minutes taken by: Doreen Laughlin, Administrative Specialist II
Called to order by: Chairman Carl Switzer
Time Started: 6:40 pm
Time Ended: 9:00 pm
Commissioners Present: Carolyn Barkley; Vice Chair Alexander Craghead; Ralph Hughes; Chairman Carl Switzer; Lily Lilly; Alice Ellis Gaut
Commissioners Absent: Roger Potthoff; <del>Suzanne Gallagher</del> [Amended to delete former Commissioner]

**Others Present:** Marland Henderson, Lisa Olson, etc.

**Staff Present:** Tom Coffee, Community Development Director; Phil Nachbar, Senior Planner; Doreen Laughlin, City Admin Specialist II

### **Agenda Item #1: Welcome and Introductions**

**Important Discussion and/or Comments:** There were some members of the public present, so the CCAC members and staff introduced themselves. It was mentioned by Chair Switzer that there would be a time for public comment later in the evening and the public would be asked to introduce themselves at that time.

**Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):** None

### **Agenda Item #2: Review/Approve Minutes**

#### **Important Discussion and/or Comments:**

There were visitors present, so Chair Switzer decided that in the interest of time, the public, and efficiency, this agenda item was moved to after agenda item #3 (public plaza location options) which is what most of the visitors present were interested in.

After agenda item #3 was discussed, this agenda item was addressed. At this time, it was moved and seconded to approve the July 18<sup>th</sup> minutes for the CCAC regular meeting.

**Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):** A vote was taken and the 7/18/07 minutes were unanimously approved, with no abstentions.

**Agenda Item #3: Plaza Location Options /Public Comment – Discussion/Recommendations**

**Important Discussion and/or Comments:** Phil Nachbar began his presentation by talking about the process and the review bodies involved regarding the location of the Fanno Creek Plaza. He noted that programming had been added since the last meeting. He presented a PowerPoint presentation. (Exhibit A is the PowerPoint presentation in total). He pointed out an aerial view showing the boundaries for the plaza and park (Exhibit A, p.2). He showed the site characteristics of the park (pp 5 & 6) and the vegetated corridor (p.7). He noted the park would be more of a nature area rather than a developed park although he also noted there is some area available for a traditional park. He said there are economic considerations (p. 13) and gave some illustrations as to how the plaza could possibly be used (p. 15). The slideshow showed photos of examples of possible ways to use the gathering space. Nachbar noted that this space can be used any way the community would like it to be used, and it would be roughly 10,000 square feet. He said you do not necessarily need a lot of space for a nice plaza, and pointed to the city of Portland as an example of a city having a public plaza that is, basically, the same size. He spoke about several options available for the plaza and talked about the possibility of interactive fountains (e.g. pp 34, 35), having some “soft space” (e.g. pp 36-38), or possibly a sunken plaza which could be designed by Walker Macy.

Nachbar continued his presentation by discussing each of the possible locations – giving pros and cons of each (pp. 41-44). He said his thoughts are that Scheme 1 appears to be the best location. Chair Switzer (who is also chair of the Fanno Creek Steering Committee) was asked to give a brief overview of that committee’s recommendations. Switzer gave the overview saying the official recommendation from them is to support Scheme 1 (p.41). He gave some reasons as to why the other schemes were not as desirable – such as the noise factor, too far from the park, uncooperative property owners, too close to Hwy 99, etc. He said they believed the plaza and the park should be integrated /connected. He noted some of the reasons they liked the concept of Scheme 1 the best:

- The plaza would be integrated into the park
- Visibility from Main Street
- Immediately adjacent re-developable property
- Connection to Commuter rail parking which could be used on weekends when the plaza is being used by many people
- Green street / urban creek idea

He said again that, in concept, the one they liked the best was Scheme 1. He said it would not be exactly what was pictured – but the general “concept of the location” is what they were recommending.

Switzer asked Commissioner Ellis Gaut, who is also on the steering committee, for her input on this. She noted several things she liked about the site. The “bonus apace” across the street was of particular interest as she said it has tremendous potential for a possible “mini-plaza.” Another plus she noted was that in terms of “land assembly” Scheme 1 turns out to be the easiest. Nachbar took some time explaining why this was the case. There was more discussion about the smaller plaza and reasons why it would be an asset in so much as it could “reach out” to Main Street.

At this point, Switzer opened up the discussion to the public and some of the comments follow:

Mike Swanda, who was also a member of the Fanno Creek Steering Committee, said all the schemes had benefits and he talked about some of those benefits. He said of them all, he was a hold out for scheme 1.

Commissioner Hughes noted he would like future slides and visuals to include the parking areas so they could be clearly seen. Nachbar said that was a good point and in the future those areas would be shown clearly.

Citizen, Deanna Nihill, identified herself as a 3<sup>rd</sup> generation Tigard resident. She said she was very pleased to see what was being done. She noted she would love to have a public plaza in Tigard, right close to home, so her family wouldn’t have to go to Beaverton, Lake Oswego, or any of the other surrounding cities, to have something like the plaza available. She likes the idea of it being connected to greenspace and near the park. She indicated she was in favor of Scheme 1, and would like the plaza situated away from Hwy 99W. She wanted it to be a bike/kid/family friendly area.

Marland Henderson indicated that he supports Scheme #1 as well, especially as it pertains to Farmer’s Markets.

There was a question as to whether a trail system to the library would be made. Nachbar said yes, there would. He said the trail system through the park, which goes across to the library, would be reconstructed, lighted, and interconnected. He said there is a project to have a lighted crossing of some kind that will stop traffic on Hall Blvd to make it easier for pedestrians to get across Hall Blvd to the library.

Lisa Olson, who was a member of the task force (TDIP), said that group as a whole had felt a public plaza or public gathering spot should be connected to a park. She said Scheme 1 supports those findings.

Commissioner Lilly noted that Scheme 1 was her first choice. From a sustainable point of view, she believes the plaza could be an anchor.

Chair Switzer asked if anyone wanted to make a motion. Commissioner Lilly made a motion. (See motion under “action items” below.) Switzer explained that the recommendation is to support *conceptually* the Stevens Marine site - Scheme 1 - as the location for the plaza. He reiterated that it would not necessarily be the exact same thing as is on the drawing, but that the “concept” is what they supported. Tom Coffee, Community Development Director, noted that the Fanno Creek Steering Committee had endorsed Site 1 (Scheme 1), and the associated concepts, and that action had been communicated to Council.

**Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):** Commissioner Lilly made a motion... “I move that the CCAC vote to recommend and support the steering committees recommendation.” There was some discussion regarding exactly what the recommendation was and, after some time, Commissioner Lilly added a friendly amendment, which was: “I move to endorse the concepts presented in Scheme one, including the plaza location on the Stevens marine property.” The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ellis Gaut; a vote was taken, and the motion unanimously passed.

One of the Commissioners asked that “Council communication” (the idea of “face time”) be on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting. Nachbar said this would be added to the next agenda.

#### **Agenda Item #4: Downtown Street Lights – Review/Recommendations**

**Important Discussion and/or Comments:** The discussion was begun by Tom Coffee. He explained the look of the acorn style streetlight that had been decided on for the downtown area. (Exhibit B). Coffee said he told the City Manager they were ready to go ahead with this. Since the City Manager had a meeting with the Mayor, he told the Mayor that this was what they were going to be doing. The Mayor questioned the light and said he thought they were going to use a Bridgeport Plaza type streetlight – that was going to go on the commuter rail station. They said “That’s what TriMet is doing, but TriMet is doing that on their own.” Coffee noted that is not the PGE approved acorn style light that the Streetscape Plan calls for, nor is it what CCAC called for back in February, when this was discussed. He said at a Council Study Session (August 14<sup>th</sup>) they talked to them saying “Here’s the issue – is it going to be different on the station, downtown, or are we going to try to go our own way – or what? They said, “Refer it to the CCAC”. That’s why it’s on the agenda.

There was some discussion about a memo that Councilor Wilson sent dated 8-20-07. (Exhibit C). Coffee said the Council needs to know – are they going to “stay the course” and move on, or are they going to reopen the issue?

Discussion was then opened on this [the question of lighting types] and Switzer prefaced it by saying anyone who participated in the Streetscape Group and the CCAC has every reason to gripe about this, but that they need to just acknowledge they've "hit a bump" and need to move forward through it. There was discussion as to whether the delay would be too long if this whole issue was reopened. Coffee answered that there's time. Some of the Commissioners said they didn't feel the choices were there to begin with. They didn't like any of them but had to choose between two that they didn't like. It was noted it would be twice the cost to do something other than a PGE approved light. Lisa Olson explained what the decision was regarding lights. It had to be a PGE approved light.

Tom Coffee said he realizes the people who have dealt with this issue before, time and again, via the CCAC and Streetscape Taskforce have every right to feel frustrated, and even angry that this has come up again. He stressed that no one was saying the original decision was wrong, but that now the opportunity has presented itself to be able to consider a completely new range of lights that people in these groups did not know was available. Coffee said if the issue were opened up again, they would have to get the facts - the cost comparisons. Then they will have to discuss how this will get done, who's going to do it, how long is it going to take – all that. He said if the CCAC goes down that road these are the implications involved in opening it up.

#### **Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):**

- A straw poll was taken as to whether to reopen this issue.

Those in favor of reopening were:

1. Commissioner Hughes (if it is done in a timely manner – within 60 days)
2. Commissioner Ellis Gaut
3. Commissioner Lilly, and
4. Chair Switzer.

Those against reopening were:

1. Commissioner Barkley, and
2. Commissioner Craghead.

Chair Switzer stated that with a 4-2 vote in favor, the majority rules, and the issue would be reopened; however, Chair Switzer asked that it be noted the CCAC has expressed exasperation, frustration, and dismay at this.

- Staff will communicate with TriMet soon that, despite earlier discussions, the "light" question is back open and they will be communicating with them on a weekly basis. They need to state if there is a "drop dead" date that needs to be met.

#### **Agenda Item #5: Selection of alternate to Joint Planning/CCAC Committee on Land Use Regulations:**

**Important Discussion and/or Comments:** Nachbar said Sean Farrelly, Associate Planner, has asked to have an alternate on the joint Planning/CCAC Committee. Commissioner Lilly volunteered to do it.

**Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):** Commissioner Lilly will be the new alternate on the Joint Planning/CCAC Committee on Land Use Regulations

**Agenda Item #6: Recognition of Contributions to Downtown**


**Important Discussion and/or Comments:** Nachbar said he would like the CCAC to consider some kind of recognition of contributions to Downtown. The question was asked – “What will this look like?” Tom Coffee noted things are happening downtown on the initiative of individuals and groups. His idea is the City simply let them know it’s been noticed. The City should thank them, and give them some sort of recognition - perhaps a plaque of some sort, or a certificate. It was noted that anyone who has done something to contribute to downtown should be recognized. He said there could be categories. It was mentioned the Tigard Eye Clinic (Drs. Smith) have always kept up a very nice appearance. Perhaps the City should say ‘great job’ – communicate in some way with people who are trying to beautify the area.


**Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):** It was decided this is a good idea. Staff will bring some examples of ideas as soon as possible. Nachbar noted that a lot is going on, but he will try to get to it as soon as he can.

**Agenda Item #7: Other Business/Announcements**

**Important Discussion and/or Comments:** It was noted there is still a need for two more regular CCAC members and two alternates. September 12<sup>th</sup> will be the next scheduled meeting and will be held at the Community Room in the library. All CCAC members are invited to the Council meeting on the 28<sup>th</sup>, but should not feel obligated to come.

**Action Items (Follow-Up or Votes):** Chair Switzer adjourned the meeting at 9:00 pm.

  
Doreen Laughlin, City Admin. Specialist II

ATTEST:   
Chairman Carl Switzer